DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 351 24 CG 006 769

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund W.
TITLE 1970 APGA Research Training Program. Final Report.
INSTITUTION American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.; Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO BR-0-0184
PUB DATE Jun 71
GRANT OEG-0-70-2854(520)
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Counselor Educators; *Counselor Training; Educational Improvement; Guidance Personnel; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Improvement; *Research; Research Methodology; Research Skills; *Research Utilization

ABSTRACT

This report describes the initial planning, participant selection, and participant evaluation of 5 1970 American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) Research Training Sessions. All were designed specifically to improve the quality of research skills and competencies of trained counselor educators. The 5 sessions, each 5 days long, were entitled: (1) Computer Technology in Guidance; (2) Systems Research for Counselors, Counselor Educators and Supervisors; (3) Utilizing Research to Improve Counseling Programs; (4) Field Oriented Research in Ecological Studies and Development Models for Counselors, Counselor-Educators, and Supervisors; and (5) Problems of Research Supervision and Consultation. A fairly comprehensive description of each training session is provided which includes: (1) purposes and objectives; (2) schedule; (3) demographic and other participant data; (4) instructional materials; (5) a summary of participants' evaluations of the program; and (6) evaluation by the session director. (TL)

ED056351

0-0184
PA 24
OE-NCERD
CG

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 0-0184

Grant No. OEG-0-70-2854 (520)

1970 APGA RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

AMERICAN PERSONNEL AND GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION

June 1971

U. S. Department
of
Health, Education and Welfare

Office of Education
Research Training Branch
National Center for Educational Research

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 006 769

FINAL REPORT

Grant Number: OEG-0-70-2854 (520)

Project Number: 0-0184

1970 APGA RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM

Edmund W. Gordon
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

for the

American Personnel and Guidance Association
1607 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

June 1971

The research reported herein was supported through a grant received from the Research Training Branch, National Center for Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely, their professional judgement in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. Office of Education
Research Training Branch
National Center for Educational Research

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The APGA research training sessions were designed specifically to improve the quality of research skills and competencies of trained counselor educators. Towards this end, APGA was fortunate in attracting exceptionally qualified personnel to implement the training program.

The author of this report wishes to acknowledge the efforts of the many individuals who made it possible to conduct the 1970 APGA Research Training Sessions. Noted among these, of course, were the directors and staff of the individual sessions, who devoted immeasurable time and effort toward ensuring high quality of training for the participants. The names of these individuals are cited in the report.

The APGA Research Training Session Committee is to be commended for its diligence in carrying forth the responsibilities assigned to it, particularly its selection of high caliber training programs and directors.

The central staff of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, through the effective guidance and administrative support of Dyckman Vermilye, should receive special acknowledgement. In many respects, the extensive efforts of APGA staff in working out planning problems, locating suitable meeting facilities and in handling financial arrangements were instrumental in effecting the successes programs reported.

Finally, thanks are due to Mrs. Effie Bynum, who assumed primary responsibility for the day-to-day administrative tasks of the Research Training Sessions preceeding their operations.

Edmund W. Gordon

June 1971

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PLANNING OF THE RESEARCH TRAINING SESSIONS

SELECTION OF APPLICANTS AND PROCESSING OF APPLICANTS

EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING SESSIONS

RESEARCH TRAINING SESSION DESCRIPTIONS:

Presession I: Computer Technology in Guidance

Presession II: Systems Research for Counselors, Counselor-Educators and Supervisors

Presession III: Utilizing Research to Improve Counseling Programs

Presession IV: Field Oriented Research in Ecological Studies and Development Models for Counselors, Counselor-Educators, and Supervisors

Presession V: Problems of Research Supervision and Consultation

INTRODUCTION

The American Personnel and Guidance Association conducted five research training sessiond during 1970. Four of these were held in New Orleans, March 17-21, preceding the Annual Convention of the Association. The fifth one was held in Chicago, Illinois, November 7-11, prior to the Fall meeting of the North Central Association for Counselor Education and Supervision.

This initial effort of the Association attracted a total of 287 applications. Of this number, 178 were accepted and a total of 128 counselors, counselor-educators and counselor-supervisors were in attendance for the full five-day sessions.

The program was supported by a grant from the Research Training Branch, Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education. The participants assumed responsibility for their own room and board.

This report describes the initial planning, selection, participant evaluation of the 1970 APGA Research Training Sessions and the report of session directors.

PLANNING

Early in May of 1969, a preliminary narrative proposal for Federal support of several five-day intensive training programs on research and developmental activities in guidances services was submitted to Mr. Richard Harbeck, Chief of the Research Training Branch, National Center for Educational Research and Development, U.S. Office of Education. Subsequent to this request for funding, a proposal for the establishment of an APGA Research Training Session Committee was submitted to the Executive Committee of APGA. That Committee's endorsement of the proposal was followed by an invitation from the APGA President to the Presidents of each of the eight divisions of the association to appoint and fund a divisional representative as a member of the APGA Research Training Session Committee. Six of the divisions appointed a member and supported his expenses to a two-day meeting of the committee in Washington, D.C. on July 8th and 9th. The president of APGA designated a seventh person to serve as chairman. The responsibilities of the committee were outlined as follows:

1. To meet and review proposals for research training sessions, and to select from among available proposals--or suggest others that are more appropriate--and forward recommendations to the Research Training Branch of the Bureau of Research...

2. To determine the specific criteria to be applied against the credentials of those who later submit applications to attend one or more of the sessions...

3. To implement an overall evaluation of the sessions. Although each session director and his staff will be expected to carry out his own pre- and post-session evaluations, the Committee will have to develop or approve a recommended evaluation procedure, and then consider the results once they have been obtained.

4. To meet with the Program Directors to help in the exchange of ideas on structure, procedures, instructional techniques, scheduling, participants selection, the development of comparable format for evaluating and reporting, and other problems that will have become apparent as the first experience of sessions is completed.

In addition, other specific responsibilities were assigned to the chairman. He was designed to be

1. the official Project Officer

2. identified in all APGA publicity as the person to whom one should write for additional information about any of the announced sessions

3. the one to whom all applications would be submitted by those who wish to attend a session

4. the one over whose name the APGA evaluation will be distributed

5. the one who would submit the final report

The following individuals served as members of the APGA Research Training Session Committee:

Dr. Edmund W. Gordon, Chairman
American Personnel and Guidance Association
Teachers College, Columbia University

Dr. Thomas L. Blaskovics
American Rehabilitation Counseling Association
West Virginia University

Dr. Donald G. Hays
American School Counselor Association
Fullerton Union High School District, California

Dr. Donald P. Hoyt
American College Personnel Association
Kansas State University

Dr. Daniel Sinick
Association for Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance
George Washington University

Dr. Otto Speilbichler
Association for Counselor Education and Supervision
University of Maryland

Dr. David V. Tiedeman
National Vocational Guidance Association
Harvard University

The June issue of the Guidepost, the official Newsletter of the Association, included a notice about the possibility of research training sessions to the membership, and an invitation was extended for research training topics centered around research techniques and developmental activities.

As indicated above, the Committee, with the exception of Dr. Hays, met during July. At that time, several research training proposals were available for them to consider. The very tight time schedule and the necessity of making decisions on those proposals prompted extensive discussion of the purposes of the training sessions, the goals which the association hoped would be achieved by the sessions and many procedural questions. Dr. Richard Harbeck, U.S. Office of Education, met with the group one morning to answer questions and to provide information. Mr. Gary Hanna, of the American Educational Research Association, met with the Committee the first evening to share information about his experiences with similar training programs sponsored by AERA.

At the conclusion of the July meeting, each committee member agreed to contact one of those whose proposal had been reviewed favorably by the Committee or to initiate contact with someone the Committee felt would be appropriate to conduct a session. Five sessions were developed and, for the most part, the individuals first recommended by the Committee to serve as session directors accepted the invitation.

The session directors were asked to submit a prospectus, outlining the way in which they perceived their training sessions being conducted. The statements

submitted were reviewed with Mr. Harbeck in the Research Training Branch and were returned to the directors, with comments and suggestions for revisions. A more detailed program proposal was submitted by each director in September and these proposals were incorporated into an APGA Proposal to the U.S. Office of Education and was subsequently approved for funding.

Program titles and the names of directors of the five sessions held are as follows:

SESSION	TITLE	DIRECTOR
I	Computer Technology in Guidance	C.E. Helm City University of New York
II	Systems Research for Counselors, Counselor-Educators, and Supervisors	T. Antionette Ryan University of Hawaii
III	Utilizing Research to Improve Counseling Programs	Gary R. Walz University of Michigan
IV	Field Oriented Research in Ecological Studies and Development Models for Counselors, Counselor-Educators, and Supervisors	Francis A. J. Ianni Teachers College, Columbia University
V	Problems of Research, Supervision, and Consultation	Chris D. Kehas Claremont Graduate School

Advance arrangements were made with the Jung Hotel in New Orleans to accommodate the four sessions held in that city. Arrangements for the Chicago pre-conference workshop were made with the Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, Illinois.

A two-day meeting of the five session directors, Chairman of the APGA Research Training Session Committee and staff of the parent association was held at the Jung Hotel on February 19 and 20, 1970. The meeting served, principally, as an on-site investigation of facilities, and available equipment and afforded the opportunity for directors to exchange ideas on instructional techniques to develop common logistical procedures and a format for reporting and evaluating, and to discuss procedures for selecting participants to ensure that all acceptable applicants would be accommodated. The fact that one of the session directors had had previous experience as director of a training session proved invaluable in the resolution of minor problems discussed.

SELECTION OF APPLICANTS AND PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS

Participation in the 1970 APGA Research Training Sessions was not restricted to association members. Although each director indicated the qualifications he would be looking for in applicants for his particular session, the only general requirement was that participants be full or part-time counselors, counselor-educators or counselor-supervisors. Graduate students enrolled in institutions of higher learning were not considered since the training sessions were designed to upgrade the skills of those whose formal graduate programs had been completed.

Applications for the five sessions were mailed to the APGA membership as well as to about 250 counselor-educators on a special mailing list. Each applicant noted a first and second choice of sessions preferred and returned the application to the committee chairman, who recorded receipt of application and mailed the form to the first choice director. Insofar as possible each applicant was admitted to his first choice of sessions. However, in instances where the applicant's qualifications did not meet those set by the director, the application was forwarded to the director of the applicant's alternate choice. All acceptable applicants were accommodated in one or another of the sessions and were notified of acceptance by the director of the session to which they were admitted, together with information concerning location and scheduling of program, special reading requirements and fees for printed materials, where applicable.

EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING SESSIONS

An anonymous evaluation was made by the participants of the various sessions. The questionnaire used, a facsimile of the AERA 1970 Participant Evaluation Form, was administered by session directors and staff on the last day of the presessions. The type of questions included the following:

1) The overall quality of instruction in your session was: ____Excellent, ____Good, ____Average, ____Fair, ____Poor

2) Leaving aside the quality of instruction for the moment, do you think the topic treated in your session should be included in next year's Presession Program? ____Yes ____No

3) If you had it to do over again, would you apply for the session which you have just completed? ____Yes ____No

4) If this same session is held again, would you recommend that others attend? ____Yes ____No

5) How good was the scheduling and management of the Presession you attended? _____Very good, _____Good, _____Poor, _____Very poor

6) How good were the meeting room facilities for the Presession you attended? _____Very good, _____Good, _____Poor, _____Very poor

7) Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this Presession of research, teaching, or administrative value to you? _____More than necessary, _____Just the right amount, _____Not enough

8) Did the teaching staff make sufficient allowance for the variability in prior knowledge brought to the Presession by the participants? _____Nearly all the time, _____Most of the time, _____Some of the time, _____Hardly ever

9) Was there sufficient time for you to interact with the staff with respect to information and knowledge presented in the Presession? _____Yes _____No

10) Did the amount of work required by the staff, of the participants, seem acceptable to you? There was: _____Too much, _____Just about right, _____Too little

11) Would you like to learn more on the topic you studied here? _____Yes _____No

12) Was five days a sufficient time to learn and master the materials of your Presession? _____Yes _____No

The Tables reported herein are based only on an analysis of the questionnaire administered to program participants of Sessions I*, II* and IV. (The forms were not submitted to us by Sessions III and V.) A study of the individual session reports, however, reveals a similar pattern of response concerning varying aspects of the presessions.

*All the participants did not complete the questionnaire.

In Table I, the percentage distribution of responses to the question related to the overall quality of instruction shows that within three sessions, 97 percent of the participants considered the sessions between good and excellent, with the overwhelmingly larger percentage reporting an excellent rating. The statistics speak highly not only of the Committee's choice of directors, but of the staff which directors chose to assist them.

Tables II, III and IV which relate to the feasibility of including the session in the 1971 program, whether or not participants would apply for the session again and if participants would recommend that others attend, show that participants were almost 100 percent in responding affirmatively to the three questions posed. Only in Table III was there a 3 percent "No" response concerning participants' desire to reapply for the same session--a response which should not be considered negative in any way.

Such universal agreement suggests that the presession programs were exceptionally beneficial to the participants and that they valued the instruction received enough to endorse its continuance and recommendation to other researchers.

The majority of the participants found the scheduling and management of the presession (Table V) acceptable, with 95 percent rating these aspects good to very good. Five percent of the participants felt that scheduling and management were poor. Some of the participants (even those who gave the rating good or very good) noted that the evening schedules were somewhat tedious and expressed the feeling that it would have been more advantageous had the reading materials been mailed in advance of the workshop.

According to the statistics in Table VI, 75 percent of the participants found meeting room facilities from good to very good and 25 percent felt that the facilities were undesirable. The major complaint dealt with the noise factor as a result of the closeness of the meeting rooms, and with the numerous changes made in room assignments.

The statistics reported in Table VII show that 61 percent of the participants felt they had sufficient prerequisite skills for the training. It is not surprising that the highest percentage of the participants who considered their prior knowledge inadequate came from Session I which was involved with Computer Technology and that the highest percentage of those who considered themselves as having knowledge beyond what was necessary for the session were enrolled in Session IV which took the behavioristic approach primarily.

TABLE I The overall quality of instruction in your session was: Excellent, Good, Average, Fair, or Poor

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Excellent	63	79	61	70
Good	37	21	28	27
Average	0	0	11	3
Fair	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE II Leaving aside the quality of instruction for the moment, do you think the topic treated in your session should be included in next year's presession program? Yes or No

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Yes	100	100	100	100
No	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE III If you had to do it over again, would you apply for the session which you have just completed? Yes or No

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Yes	100	100	.89	97
No	0	0	11	3
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE IV If this same session is held again, would you recommend that others attend? Yes or No

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Yes	100	100	100	100
No	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE V How good was the scheduling and management of the Presession you attended? Very good, Good, Poor, or Very poor

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Very good	44	91	22	61
Good	56	9	61	34
Poor	0	0	17	5
Very poor	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE VI How good were the meeting room facilities for the Presession you attended? Very good, Good, Poor, or Very poor

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Very good	25	6	28	17
Good	44	64	61	58
Poor	19	18	11	16
Very poor	12	12	0	9
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE VII Do you think you had the appropriate prerequisites or prior knowledge to make what you learned at this Presession of research, teaching, or administrative values to you? More than necessary, Just the right amount, Not enough

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
More than necessary	6	15	22	15
Just the right amount	50	64	67	61
Not enough	44	21	11	24
Total Number	16	33	18	67

As indicated by statistics in Table VIII there was a positive response noted by participants regarding the allowance staff made for variability in the prior knowledge participants possessed. Although the levels of allowance staff made varied, none of the participants felt there was a lack of flexibility. This aspect of the program emphasizes the ability of instructors to communicate effectively to a diversified group of participants.

Table IX shows the response to the question related to whether the amount of work required by staff of the participants was acceptable. Eighteen percent of the participants felt that the requirements were unreasonable, again focussing on the amount of reading required and the pace of the evening schedule. All of the responses denoting too little required were given by participants in Session IV. This suggests that overall the expectations staff had as to what might be accomplished were well thought out.

The importance of the sessions held and the degree of their value to the participants is indicated in Table X, which shows that 100 percent of the participants reported that they desire to learn more on the topic studied in the presession attended.

As reported in Table XI, slightly more than 50 percent of the participants viewed five days as sufficient time to learn and master the material of the pre-session attended. Of the overall 48 percent of respondents answering "No" to the question, the largest percentage came from participants involved in the Computer Technology session.

Many of the participants who answered "No" did not indicate what they considered sufficient time for coverage of presession material (43 percent). Among those who did give an opinion, 33 percent indicated that they would attend a two-week presession on the same material as compared to 24 percent who noted that they would consider a seven-day presession sufficient time.

TABLE VIII Did the teaching staff make sufficient allowance for the variability in prior knowledge brought to the Pre-sessions by the participants? Nearly all of the time, Most of the time, Some of the time, Hardly ever

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Nearly all the time	50	40	39	42
Most of the time	31	36	39	36
Some of the time	19	24	22	22
Hardly ever	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE IX Did the amount of work required by the staff, of the participants, seem acceptable? There was: Too much, Just about right, Too little

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Too much	6	33	0	18
Just about right	94	67	83	78
Too little	0	0	17	4
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE X Would you like to learn more on the topic you studied there? Yes or No

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Yes	100	100	100	100
No	0	0	0	0
Total Number	16	33	18	67

TABLE XI Was five days a sufficient time to learn and master the material of your Presession? Yes or No

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
Yes	44	55	56	52
No	56	45	44	48
Total Number	16	33	18	67

If no, would you attend a seven-day or two-week Presession on the same material? No; Yes, seven days; Yes, two weeks

Response in Percent	Presession Number 1	2	4	Total Percent
No	6	6	11	7
Yes, 7 days	19	27	22	24
Yes 2 weeks	44	21	45	33
No response	31	46	22	36
Total Number	16	33	18	67

The concluding section of this report contains descriptions of the five Research Training Sessions, which include the following components:

1. Title of Session
2. Staff
3. General Description
4. Purposes and Objectives
5. Schedule
6. Participants
7. Instructional Materials
8. Evaluation
9. Director's Evaluation

The descriptions are drawn, predominately, from reports submitted by the session directors. Minor editing was undertaken in order that the reports might be presented in as uniformed a format as possible.

RESEARCH TRAINING SESSION DESCRIPTIONS

PRESESSION I

1. Title: COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY IN GUIDANCE

2. Staff:

C. E. Helm (Director)	The City University of New York New York, New York
David Archibald	Center for Educational Software Development New England School Development Council
Wailand Bessent	University of Texas at Austin Austin, Texas
Mrs. Mary Farrell	The City University of New York New York, New York
Stanley Fisher	The City University of New York New York, New York
Miss Elaine Kirsh	The City University of New York New York, New York
Max Weiner	The City University of New York New York, New York

3. General Description:

The presession was designed to introduce counselors, counselor-educators, and supervisors to fundamental concepts of the science and technology of computation, and to educational applications of computer technology which have particular relevance to guidance functions.

The explosive growth of the science and technology of information processing encompassing the field of communication as well as the field of computation will have an enormous impact on the processes of education. It is of the utmost importance that counselors, counselor-educators, and supervisors be thoroughly familiar with these fields because of the key role they must play in bringing about vitally needed changes in education, many of which become possible because of modern information technology.

The underlying theme of the presession was the representation problem; that is, what are characteristics of useful modes of representation of educational problems and processes that facilitate rigorous analysis and solution. The science and technology of computation can provide tremendous power for such analysis; however, it is the educator who must formulate the questions in a relevant manner.

4. Purposes and Objectives:

Specifically the program was designed to achieve the following objectives:

1. Participants would acquire an understanding at an elementary level of basic concepts in the science and technology of computation.

2. Participants would be able to use these concepts together with their prior knowledge of educational principles and practices to acquire an understanding of the design, operation, and evaluation of computer-based guidance systems, computer-assisted instruction systems, and automatic school scheduling systems.

5. Schedule:

Day I

Overview and Orientation
Fundamentals of Computation:
General Concepts (software and hardware)
Introduction to the use of programming languages to represent problems, discussion of interaction between language and data base
Lecture on the BASIC programming language
Lecture on the BASIC programming language (continued)

Day II

Overview and Orientation
Computer Based Guidance: introduction to the Information System for Vocational Decisions, evaluation of present system
Script writing
Special interest seminars:
1) Computer-based guidance
2) Management information system
3) BASIC
Special interest seminars:
1) BASIC
2) SMISR - A Simple Information Storage and Retrieval System

Day III

Overview and Orientation
Computer-Assisted Instruction: history and advantages of CAI, discussion and demonstration of classes of CAI program
Demonstration of INBASKET
Special interest groups:
1) CAI
2) Computer-Based Guidance
3) BASIC
Special interest groups:
1) BASIC

Day IV

Overview and Orientation
Computer-Based Scheduling: introduction to scheduling support systems, schedule builders
General applications, scheduling algarithms, educational implications of various approaches
Special interest groups:
1) Computer-Based Scheduling
2) BASIC
3) Computer-Based Guidance
Special interest group:
1) BASIC

Day V

Evaluation of educational programs; problems of researchers in school setting
Discussion of relationship between counselor and computer
Summary and evaluation of Presession

6. Participants:

Of the twenty-three participants, ten are male and thirteen are female. Fifteen participants are at the masters level, most of whom have acquired credits toward the doctorate; six of the participants have doctoral degrees. Ten of the participants are employed as school counselors, seven are in supervisory positions and six are employed as trainers of counselors.

7. Instructional Materials:

Advance materials were sent to participants prior to the opening of the training program. Included in this package was an extensive bibliography on the computer in education.

The staff of the presession set up a library of 72 volumes and periodicals

relating to computer technology in guidance. These materials were available throughout the presession for participants to borrow.

8. Evaluation:

A pre- and post-test, consisting of 24 questions was used in order to evaluate the level of familiarization that participants achieved in the various areas.

Participants were asked to rank their abilities on a variety of computer related tasks on a 1 - 5 scale as follows:

1) I could easily do this.

2) I would have some difficulty in doing this.

3) I would have a great deal of difficulty doing this, but could probably get it done.

4) I could probably not do this.

5) It would be hopeless for me even to attempt to do this task.

Pre-test mean "score" was 3.76 (i.e. I could probably not do this). Post-test mean score was 2.03 (i.e. I would have some difficulty in doing this). This difference is significant statistically as well as educationally.

The Formative Evaluation Questionnaire was administered twice during the presession. Results are presented in Table I.

9. Director's Evaluation:

I was most favorably impressed by the enthusiasm of the participants for the topic, Computer Technology in Guidance. I was equally impressed by the ability of the group and by their progress during the week. They appeared to gain considerable insight into the issues involved in applying computer technology to problems in guidance, as well as some familiarity with current applications.

Experience has shown that it is almost impossible for anyone to acquire an operationally useful understanding of the concepts of computer technology without some experience in computer programming. Accordingly, since the participants almost without exception had had no prior programming experience, we devoted considerable time to programming outside of the seminars. Everyone learned BASIC and wrote at least one (usually several) simple programs. The short time available made it difficult to integrate this experience with the other aspects of the presession, although participants generally felt that programming

helped clarify other issues.

It was the general consensus that practical training in programming was not readily available at their own institutions.

While the primary goal of the presession was achieved reasonably, our efforts cannot have significant impact on the profession as a whole unless the people we train can themselves have some significant impact. The best we can hope for in a 5-day seminar is to get naive participants "turned on" about the possibilities of computers in guidance. We must be able to provide extensive follow-up support for those counselors who are sufficiently interested to want to continue.

Future presessions should include a repeat of this general introduction with a greater emphasis on programming, as well as presessions on advanced topics designed for persons with sufficient background to deal in depth with specific computer applications in guidance.

TABLE I

Formative Evaluation Questionnaire Results

Key: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), ? (Undecided), D (Disagree, SD (Strongly Disagree), NA (No Answer) Please circle your choices.

	Second Day						Fifth Day					
	SA	A	?	D	SD	NA	SA	A	?	D	SD	NA
1. The objectives of this program were clear to me.	4	14	1	1	0	0	6	13	1	0	0	0
2. The objectives of this program were not realistic.	0	0	6	10	4	0	0	2	3	8	7	0
3. The participants accepted the purposes of this program.	3	13	2	1	0	1	6	13	0	0	0	1
4. The objectives of this program were not the same as my objectives.	0	0	2	12	6	0	0	3	4	6	6	1
5. I have not learned much new	0	1	1	10	8	0	0	0	0	7	13	0
6. The material presented seemed valuable to me.	7	11	2	0	0	0	11	8	1	0	0	0
7. I could have learned as much by reading a book.	0	3	1	8	8	0	0	1	0	8	11	0
8. Possible solutions to my problems are not being considered.	0	1	3	8	6	2	0	1	2	8	8	1
9. The information presented was too elementary	0	0	1	7	12	0	0	0	1	7	12	0
10. The speakers really know their subjects.	6	14	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0
11. I was stimulated to think about the topics presented.	6	14	0	0	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0
12. We worked together as well as a group.	1	9	4	4	0	2	6	12	1	0	0	1

Key: SA (Strongly Agree), A (Agree), ? (Undecided), D (Disagree), SD (Strongly Disagree), NA (No Answer) Please circle your choices.

	Second Day						Fifth Day					
	SA	A	?	D	SD	NA	SA	A	?	D	SD	NA
13. The group discussions were excellent.	0	5	3	3	0	9	6	7	5	1	0	1
14. There was little time for informal conversation.	1	2	1	10	4	2	0	1	0	8	11	0
15. I had no opportunity to express my ideas.	0	2	1	11	5	1	0	0	0	8	12	0
16. I really felt a part of this group.	0	12	2	2	2	4	4	14	1	0	0	1
17. My time was well spent.	3	14	2	1	0	0	9	10	1	0	0	0
18. The program met my expectations.	2	5	10	2	0	1	6	7	4	3	0	0
19. Too much time was devoted to trivial matters.	0	1	3	8	6	2	0	1	0	11	7	1
20. The information presented was to advanced.	0	0	9	8	3	0	0	0	0	12	9	0
21. The content was not readily applicable to much research in education.	0	0	6	10	4	0	0	0	0	8	11	1
22. The Assistant was very helpful.	2	14	3	0	0	1	11	9	0	0	0	0
23. Theory was not related to practice.	0	1	3	12	3	1	0	0	0	14	6	0
24. The schedule should have been more flexible.	0	2	5	10	1	2	1	1	0	14	4	0

PRESESSION II

1. Title: SYSTEMS RESEARCH FOR COUNSELORS, COUNSELOR-EDUCATORS, AND SUPERVISORS

2. Staff:

T. A. Ryan (Director)	University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii
Donald G. Hays	Fullerton Union High School District Fullerton, California
Ray E. Hosford	University of California Santa Barbara, California
James W. Lawrence	University of Hawaii Honolulu, Hawaii
Leonard C. Silvern	Education and Training Consultants, Co. Los Angeles, California
Norman R. Stewart	Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan
Bob Winborn	Michigan State University East Lansing, Michigan

3. General Description:

The program was designed to provide a carefully sequenced series of exercises and problems integrated with didactic instruction. It was assumed that factors influencing extent to which program aims could be achieved included participant background, staff competency, quality and quantity of information presented and practice provided.

Participants were selected who met criteria for education and experience deemed essential for progress in the course. In staff selection the intent was to combine competencies of different instructors into a strong instructional team capable of didactic presentation and supervision over problem-solving activities.

The amount and kind of information presented was controlled through the planned reference list and directed reading, including pre-conference preparation.

4. Purposes and Objectives:

The ultimate purpose of the presession in systems research was to improve counseling, counselor-education, supervision and related areas through research. The immediate program purpose was to train selected participants in use of systems research principles and techniques for planning and evaluating counseling, counselor-education, supervision and related areas. The program purpose was implemented in two primary aims:

1. to develop participants' knowledge and understanding of systems research concepts and principles as revealed by meaningful definition of analysis, synthesis, simulation, modelling, feedback, and behavioral objectives.

2. to develop participants' proficiency in using systems techniques for planning and evaluating counseling and counselor education, as revealed by design of a closed loop system with element identification, feedback, logical sequence, and part-whole relationships and correct use of signal paths, arrowhead formation, rectangular blocks, descriptors, point numeric codes, F, FF, A, and error signals.

5. Schedule:

The training program designed to achieve presession objectives was five days in duration, with daily sessions from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 Noon, and 1:00 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. Evening sessions were not scheduled as a required part of the program. The training facilities were open from 7:00 to 10:00 each evening, with instructors on hand to work with individual trainees or groups of participants. A demonstration of computer simulation and presentation of mathematical modelling were given during the evening hours.

The presession opened with an orientation to the training program. This was followed immediately by a pre-test to determine extent to which participants already were capable of demonstrating the terminal behaviors defined in the program objectives. There were seven major elements in the program, following completion of the pre-test: (1) instruction in basic concepts and principles to reinforce required pre-conference reading; (2) basic instruction in skill development; (3) advanced instruction in concepts and techniques; (4) practice in applying systems skills and techniques; (5) post-test to determine extent to where participants had progressed toward criterion performance; (6) application of concepts and techniques in developing a solution to a real-life problem; and (7) presentation of models demonstrating systems research in counseling and counselor-education.

The learning activities implemented to achieve Objective 1, developing participants' understanding of systems concepts and principles, included assigned reading, lecturer, slide-tape presentations, films, individualized activities with programmed material, and supervised practice on workbook exercises.

Activities to achieve Objective 2, developing participants' proficiency in using systems techniques and skills included film-tape presentation, and supervised practice on individual and group problems, including work on analysis, synthesis, and flow chart modelling. Advanced exercises and extra assignments were utilized to help meet individual needs.

Day I

Morning:
- Pre-Assessment
- Introductions
- Program Overview: Purposes, Objectives
  Procedures
- Defining Goals and Objectives
- Model for Producing a System (use of slide tape)
- LOGOS Language for Flow chart (use of slide tape and Individualized Activity)

Afternoon:
- Systems Engineering of Learning (use of filmstrip tape)
- Question-and-Answer Perior
- Analysis as a Process (Individualized Activity)
- Systems Using (use of slide tape)
- Discussion
- Announcements and Assignments: Problems

Day II

Morning:
- Evaluate Solutions to Problem 1
- Synthesis as a Process (use of slide tape)
- Systems including Synthesis and CAI
- Problem 2 (Individualized Activity)
- Evaluate Solutions to Problem 2
- Model for Producing a System Model (use of slide tape)
- Study Closed Loop Instructional Flow chart
  Model: Boeing
- Problem 3 (Individualized Activity)

Afternoon:
- Evaluate Solutions to Problem 3
- Problem 4 Satellite
- Evaluate Problems Solutions
- Announcements and Assignments Problem 5

Day III

Morning: Evaluate Problem Solutions - Problem 5
Study Complex. Closed Loop Instructional
Flow chart Model: Occupational Instruction
and Government Based Information
Problem 6
Evaluation of Problem Solutions

Afternoon: Problem 7
Announcements and Assignments

Day IV

Morning: Evaluate Solutions to Problem 7
Post-Assessment
Real-life Problem

Afternoon: Real-life Problem
Announcements and Assignments

Day V

Morning: Evaluate Solutions to Real-life Problems
Program Evaluation
A Counseling Model

Afternoon: Model for a District Testing Program
Review and Preview: Systems Approach-Implications
for Counseling, Guidance, Counselor-Education
and Supervision

6. Participants:

Forty-five participants were selected from sixty-three applicants for the presession. Attrition of five left forty in attendance during the training program. Participant characteristics are given below:

Sex	Number
Male	27
Female	13
N=	40

Highest Educational Degree Attained

Degree	Number
Bachelors degree	2
Masters degree	10
Doctoral candidate	3
Doctoral degree	25
N=	40

Place of Residence

Region	State	Number
South		
	Florida	1
	Alabama	1
	Mississippi	1
	South Carolina	2
	Georgia	1
		6
Southwest		
	Arkansas	2
	Louisiana	4
	Oklahoma	1
	Texas	9
		16
East	New Jersey	1
	New York	2
	Maryland	3
	Kentucky	1
	Massachusetts	1
		8
Midwest		
	Missouri	1
	Ohio	1
	Michigan	2
	Nebraska	1
	Indiana	2
	Illinois	1
		8
West		
	Washington	1
	California	1
		2
N =		40

Nature and Place of Employment

Employer	Position	Number
University or College		
	Dean	1
	Assistant Dean	1
	Chairman	4
	Director	1
	Professor	9
	Assoc. Professor	4
	Asst. Professor	9
	Coordinator	1
	Instructor	1
	Res. Associate	1
	Counselor	2
		34
Local School		
	Counselor	2
	Asst. Director	1
		3
Agency, Military		
	Counselor	2
	Director	1
		3
N=		40

7. Instructional Materials:

Prior to the start of the presession, enrollees were sent a materials packet, with directions for pre-conference reading, seven reference materials, syllabus and staff directory.

8. Evaluation:

Two measures were taken to evaluate participant performance against program objectives: an objective pre- posttest and subjective participant self-evaluation. Evaluation of the research training session was accomplished by comparing pre- and posttest group profiles and by comparing pre- and posttest scores against criterion standards for acceptable performance. The pre-posttest was designed to sample behaviors defined by Aims 1 and 2, developing understanding of concepts and principles of systems research and developing proficiency in using systems techniques. The pre- posttest instrument consisted of three subtests, two of which sampled behaviors of concept understanding, and one sampled proficiency in using systems techniques.

Table 1 shows the group profile for median scores on the pre- and posttest by program objectives. Inspection of Table 1 reveals that the posttest median scores for understanding of concepts exclusive of behavioral objectives were four and a half times larger than the pretest median score. The median score for the understanding of behavioral objectives was double the pretest score. The posttest score on the test of skill proficiency was three times the pretest score. When the pre- and posttest scores were compared against criterion standards for acceptable performance (Table 2), it was found that over three-fourths of the participants developed understanding of concepts excluding behavioral goals at criterion level on the posttest, with ninety percent reaching criterion level on the posttest for skill performance.

Self-evaluation against Aims 1 and 2 were taken by eliciting from participants responses to indicate their feelings about their progress to the training objectives. Table 3 reports results of participants' self-evaluations. Inspection of Table 3 reveals that 100 percent of participants felt they had developed a significant understanding of systems concepts, with 97 percent reporting they felt they had acquired proficiency in using systems techniques.

A program evaluation was made to assess program management, by gathering data on learning activities, instructional materials, program content, and program organization.

Participants rated learning activities on a four-point scale, indicating degree to which the activity contributed to achievement of program goals. Mean ratings are reported in Table 4. Examination of data reported in Table 4 reveals all of activities were rated above the chance mean. The learning activities rated as most worthwhile in helping participants reach program goals were problem solving tasks, assigned readings, and conferences with staff.

Table 1

Comparison of Group Profiles of Median
Scores for Pre- and Posttest by Program Objective

Program Objective	Median Score	
	Pretest	Posttest
Developing understanding of systems concepts exclusive of behavioral objectives	9.0	40.0
Developing understanding of behavioral objectives	3.0	7.5
Developing proficiency in using systems techniques	7.5	22.0
	N= 33	N= 28

Table 2

Performance Criterion Levels for Training Objectives
and Percent of Participants Achieving Criterion Levels

Objectives	Criterion Levels of Acceptable Performance			
	Possible Score	Criterion Level	% Achieving Criterion Level	
			Pretest	Posttest
Understanding concepts exclusive of behavioral objectives	96	36	0	78
Understanding behavioral objectives	17	8	20	50
Acquiring proficiency in using systems techniques	40	20	17	90

Table 3

Participant Self Evaluation on Levels of Performance for Program Objectives

	Program Objectives	Percent of Respondents Reaching Four Levels of Performance			
		None	Little	Some	Great Amount
1.	Amount of new knowledge about system research acquired during presession.	0	0	72	28
2.	Extent of proficiency in using systems techniques developed during presession.	0	3	79	18

Table 4

Mean Rating of Training Program Learning Activities

Learning Activity	Mean Rating (Md = 3.391/2
Individual staff conference	3.69
Individual problem	3.55
Assigned reading	3.52
Lectures	3.42
Audio-visual presentations	3.37
Programmed instruction	3.27
General discussion	3.14
Task group activities	3.06

Table 5

Mean Ratings of Instructional Materials

Instructional Material	Mean Rating (Md - 3.45)
Ryan, T. A. Systems Techniques for programs of counseling and counselor-education.	3.69
Mager, R. F. Preparing instructional objectives.	3.68
Silvern, L.C. LOGOS: A system language for flowchart modeling.	3.52
Silvern, L. C. Systems engineering of education I: The evolution of systems thinking in education.	3.38
Banathy, B. Instructional systems.	3.30
Churchman, C. W. The systems approach.	2.96

Evaluation of instructional materials was made by participant rating on a four-point scale of six references which were required reading for the course. Mean ratings are reported in Table 5. Inspection of Table 5 reveals that all references were rated above the chance mean. The references rated as most valuable were Systems techniques for programs of counseling and counselor education by T. A. Ryan, and Preparing instructional objectives by Mager, with the next highest rated references being LOGOS: A system language for flowchart modeling by Silvern.

Program content was evaluated by participant rating on a four-point scale of each program unit in terms of contribution to program goals. Mean ratings are reported in Table 6. Inspection of Table 6 reveals that units considered most valuable were conceptualization of system in model form and conceptual analysis and synthesis. All units were rated above the chance mean.

Program management was evaluated by participant rating of aspects of program organization and management, including program information, meals and lodging, staff qualifications, time utilization, climate for learning, and physical facilities. Participants ratings of program management indicate some dissatisfaction with the program information, meals and living arrangements, time allocation, and physical arrangements. There was 100 percent satisfaction with the program as a whole, as indicated by response to the questions concerning scheduling of a similar presession next year.

Table 6

Mean Ratings of Program Topics

Program Topic	Mean Rating (Md = 3.49 1/2
Conceptualization of system in model form	3.72
Conceptualization analysis and synthesis	3.72
Model for producing a systems model	3.62
Problem: From Real Life Environment	3.61
Systems using feedback	3.55
Problem: Counselor Education	3.51
Rules and Symbols for flowchart modeling	3.48
Illustrations of Systems Research	3.32
Closed Loop instructional system	3.26
Problem: Guidance Management	3.07
Problem: Satellite Communication	2.82
Problem: LOGOS	2.77

9. Director's Evaluation:

Analysis of results from criterion tests indicates that the aim of developing participants' knowledge and understanding of systems concepts and principles was achieved by over three-fourths of the participants, with ninety percent of participants reaching criterion level in use of systems techniques. Analysis of test data revealed that twenty percent of participants started at criterion level on understanding of behavioral objectives. At the end of the training program, fifty percent had reached performance standards on defining behavioral objectives. The data reveal that none of the participants was at criterion level on understanding of other systems concepts at the start of the program. Seventy-eight percent reached criterion level at the end of the presession. The difference between the development of participants' understanding of behavioral objectives and their understanding of other systems concepts is explained by the nature of the program. The program design assumed a prior understanding of behavioral objectives and the learning activities were not planned to emphasize understanding of behavioral objectives. The indication that twenty percent of the participants had an understanding of behavioral objectives of the beginning of the program indicates the extent to which pre-conference reading on behavioral goals was effective. A parallel can be shown with developing participant skill proficiency in using systems techniques. On the pretest seventeen percent of participants met criterion levels of use of systems techniques. This suggests that one-fifth of participants managed to learn from the basic system skills from the pre-conference preparation. However, in looking at the participant, understanding of systems concepts, with none of the participants meeting criterion levels on the pretest, it seems that the learning of systems skills through pre-conference directed reading failed to develop an understanding of systems principles and concepts. The continued independent use of systems research for improvement and innovation of counseling, counselor education, and related areas requires more than rote skill. There must be understanding of assumptions underlying use of the systems techniques, to permit the researcher to know how and when to use systems techniques and to be able to interpret results of systems analysis and synthesis. Results of the pre-posttests suggest that an important outcome of the training session was the development of participant understanding of concepts and principles of systems research, along with developing proficiency in using systems techniques.

The evaluation of program management reflects that organization and administration were generally satisfactory, despite difficulties encountered as a result of the very late funding of the proposal and concomitant delays in announcing the program. The dissatisfaction with the time available for the presession can be taken as a positive endorsement of the program, rather than a criticism. The essence of the responses indicating dissatisfaction with amount of time for the presession has the effect of saying more time is desired to devote to the topic.

The dissatisfaction with physical facilities reflects in part the problems encountered, not only in the hotel facilities but also in the moving from one location to another in the course of the program.

Participant evaluation of instructional materials, techniques and staff reveal general satisfaction with these components of the program. There was overwhelming endorsement of the program, as indicated by one hundred percent response to the question, "Did the program meet your expectations?"

The data from participant and program evaluation suggest that the research training programs conducted in cooperation with the annual meeting of American Personnel and Guidance Association meet a very real need.

PRESESSION III

1. Title: UTILIZING RESEARCH TO IMPROVE COUNSELING PROGRAMS

2. Staff:

Gary Walz (Director)	University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
Ralph Banfield	University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
Donald Blocher	University of Minnesota Minneapolis, Minnesota
Jean Marie Furniss	Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan
Don Harrison	University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
John Hechlik	Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan
Ronald Lippitt	University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
Julie Miller	University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan
Marlene B. Pringle	Eastern Michigan University Ypsilanti, Michigan

3. General Description:

The workshop was designed to help counselors develop competencies which would enable them to effectively adapt counseling procedures to the needs of particular student groups and to evaluate the effectiveness of these new procedures. The principal emphasis of the workshop was centered around helping counselors translate their problems of research into researchable problems and procedures in order to be able to utilize findings from their own research and existing research information in the improvement of their functions as counselors.

4. Purposes and Objectives:

Specifically, the program was designed to enhance learning whereby:

Participants would develop skills in the process of translating specific problems which they encounter in their work with students into research problems and procedures.

Participants would develop skills in formulating functional school research strategies such as empirical case studies and experimental longtitudinal studies.

Participants would be introduced to and become competent in the use of the ERIC national information system.

Participants would develop a design for the operation of a local micro-information system to facilitate effective research and program decision-making.

Participants would be introduced to the idea that existing research information (as well as self-generated research information) could suggest new counseling practices and would develop skills which enable them to utilize existing research information more effectively.

5. Schedule:

Day I

Orientation
Data Collection on Participants
Conceptualizing Problems in Researchable Terms
Participant Development of Individual Research Problems
Review of Problem Statements
What Our Present Research Tells Us About Counseling Procedures

Day II

Orientation to Knowledge Utilization Process
Understanding Research Generalizations (Laboratory Experience)
Deriving Counseling Procedures from Research Generalizations
(Task Forces on Specific Counseling Areas)
Review of Knowledge Utilization Process and Sharing of Task Force Reports
Presentation and Discussion on Topics selected by group

Day III

The ERIC System (Audio Visual Presentation)
Using the ERIC System (Instruction in the use of ERIC using specially prepared materials)
Search of ERIC System (Laboratory Experience in which participant searches for information relevant to his research problem)
Developing Micro-Information Systems
Guidance Program Innovations

Day IV

Finalization of Participant Research Problems
Possible Research Designs: The Empirical Case Study and the Experimental Longitudinal Study
Designing Research Procedures
Sharing of Designs and Design Problems
Banquet and presentation on the Counselor as an Action Researcher

Day V

Strategies for Implementation of Research Designs
Strategies for Initiating New Counseling Procedures
Finalization of Written Research Plans
Workshop Evaluation
Follow-up Plans and Workshop Closing

6. Participants:

There were a total of 27 participants involved in the five-day presession. A breakdown of participant characteristics follows:

Sex	Number
Male	12
Female	15
	N = 27

Highest Degree Obtained	
Baccalaureate	1
Masters	14
Doctoral candidate	1
Doctorate	11
	N = 27

Nature of Employment	
Higher Education	19
Local Schools	7
Agency	1
	N = 27

Place of Residence

Region	State	Number	
East	Massachusetts	1	
	New York	3	
	Pennsylvania	2	
			6
Midwest	Illinois	1	
	Minnesota	1	
	Missouri	2	
	Ohio	1	
			5
South	Alabama	2	
	Arkansas	1	
	Florida	1	
	Louisiana	3	
	Mississippi	1	
	North Carolina	1	
	Tennessee	1	
	Texas	3	
	Virginia	2	
			15
West	Colorado	1	
			1
			27

7. Instructional Materials:

The workshop utilized ERIC materials, including ERIC indexes, the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors, ERIC microfiche and selected products from ERIC clearinghouses.

8. Evaluation:

The participants indicated their satisfaction with the workshop in their responses to the questionnaire prepared by the workshop staff. The following points were mentioned often as reasons for the high degree of participant satisfaction:

1. The focus of the workshop was on each individual's research needs in his home area. Most participants indicated they were returning

home with some practical new research skills that they could directly apply in their work settings.

2. The format involved a wide variety of types of participant and staff interaction which seemed to help keep members involved in the workshop process. Lecture presentations, large group interaction small group interaction, triad tasks, and staff consultation with individuals were all incorporated as part of the design. At critical points in the workshop process, participants indicated they benefited considerably from the time set aside for individual synthesis of preceding inputs.

3. The participants indicated they were exposed to some group problem-solving strategies that were new and pertinent to them, and many participants specifically indicated they could incorporate these strategies usefully in their work areas.

4. Many of the participants had been only slightly familiar with the ERIC system before the workshop and indicated they would utilize its resources in the future.

5. Participants were especially pleased with the high ratio of staff to participants.

Listed below are the planned-for participant outcomes which were successfully implemented by the workshop:

1. Development of a Research Design:

   A major workshop goal was for each participant to develop a solid feasible research design in an area of particular concern to him in his home work setting. All participants accomplished this task.

2. Familiarization with Specific Research Strategies:

   Participants were exposed to research strategies, in particular to the empirical case study and the experimental longitudinal study, and to develop the appropriate strategy for their own particular research interests.

3. Generation of New Counseling Procedures:

   Participants worked with a specific set of research generalizations and went through the process of beginning to develop a set of new counseling procedures based on the generalizations.

4. Development of Action Strategies in Utilizing Counseling Research:

Participants learned through their own participation how to effectively use group problem-solving strategies such as force-field analysis, brainstorming, and fishbowling.

5. Competency Development in the Use of Information Systems:

Participants were introduced to the ERIC national information system and learned how to make the best use of ERIC and similar systems in their home areas. As part of the workshop program, participants used the ERIC indexes, the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors, ERIC microfiche, and ERIC publications to search the available research information on their individual research topics.

9. Director's Evaluation:

The program so well received by participants on the basis of achieved outcomes and participant evaluations, must be considered a successful effort. Staff of the presession and I offer the following recommendations for future sessions:

1. Assessment of participants' expectations for workshop should be made at registration.

2. Participants should have greater input prior to the workshop as to the format and content they can expect.

3. Some assessment of research backgrounds and experience of the participants prior to the workshop might be helpfuf for design purposes. Maybe there could be a greater flexibility of design to meet more individual needs in a diverse participant population.

4. Participants indicated that "hand-outs" of condensed lectures by speakers would be helpful to take home.

5. A few participants tended to complain of "lack of structure." Written "expectation statements" for participants would fill the need for more structure in future workshops.

6. Workshop physical facilities should be more comfortable in terms of size and heating.

7. Many participants indicated they were becoming fatigued by the end of the workshop, so in the future the design should possibly be one day shorter.

8. The fact that there was a large enough staff to provide a great deal of individual attention increased the general workshop success, according to many participants. An adequate size staff appears to be a good workshop strategy in the future.

PRESESSION IV

1. Title: FIELD ORIENTED RESEARCH IN ECOLOGICAL STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENTAL MODELS FOR COUNSELORS, COUNSELOR-EDUCATORS AND SUPERVISORS

2. Staff:

Francis A. J. Ianni (Director)	Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York
Julio George	Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York
David Johnson	Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York
Barbara McNeill	Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York
Thomas Niland	Teachers College, Columbia University New York, New York
Joseph Schaeffer	Bronx State Hospital Bronx, New York
Edward Storey	Southeastem Education Laboratory Atlanta, Georgia

3. General Description:

The purpose of the presesion on field research in ecological studies and developmental models was to achieve improvement in counseling and counselor-education by training counselors, counselor-educators, and supervisors in the use and interpretation of field oriented research techniques.

Recently there has been a growing interest in field studies in the behavioral sciences. More accurately, this represents a rebirth of concern, since field-oriented research has a respectable antiquity in the social sciences. Part of this new interest results from the felt need to illuminate and extend laboratory or clinical data by observing its operation in a real setting. Of equal importance, however, is the growing conviction that given an appropriate conceptual framework and a carefully developed set of techniques, it is indeed possible to approach field studies with the same rigor as laboratory research. That is to say, field research can be just as empirical, just as experienced, just as practiced, just as inductive as any other system of

engagement with observable facts, provided that the research is properly conceptualized and methodologically defined. In fact, field-oriented research has numerous and obvious advantages over the classical experimental method. For example, in the current educational milieu, in which the community is becoming increasingly ill at ease about experimentation and testing, it is emerging as the preferred --and in many urban situations the only -- avenue for entry into the real world of education.

For the past five years two independent but closely associated groups of behavioral scientists at the Medical School of the University of California and at the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute at Teachers College, Columbia University, have been developing increasingly precise methods of observing, recording, classifying, and analyzing field data. The one-week workshop was an attempt to build on the experience of these two groups as well as others in the field.

4. Purposes and Objectives:

Specifically the program sought to assist counselors, counselor-educators, and supervisors to define field systems for research, to establish parameters, and to understand methods and techniques for observing and recording behavior in the field.

The participants were able to:

1. Develop an understanding of the relationship among experimental, survey, clinical and field research techniques and their application in the area of ecological studies and developmental models specifically and in the area of counseling in general.

2. State and apply the protocols of research techniques dealing with (a) observation, (b) recording, (c) classification, (d) analysis, and (e) interpretations of field research data and their relationship to data gathered from other forms of research.

3. Demonstrate the use of these techniques through involvement in a number of model and actual field research problems which were established as part of the training program.

4. Gain experience through preliminary training in the use of field research techniques such as observation and recording of data, the use of various electronic devices in recording field information, and techniques of analysis of data gathered in the field.

Content areas included:

1. Historical and theoretical implications of working in field situations in which behavior can be observed and collected.

2. Implications of ecological patterning and developmental sequencing as they occur in "real" as contrasted to experimental or clinical systems.

3. Definition of field systems for research purposes and establishing behavioral parameters.

4. Method and technique in observing and recording behavior in the field, participant and non-participant observation, and the use of electronic collection systems.

5. Classifying data derived from the field and preliminary taxonomies.

6. Systems of analysis for field data and their use in various types of field research.

7. Deriving theory from field-oriented research. The principal emphasis here was on the "grounded theory" approach developed at the University of California and the "situational analysis" system developed at Columbia, but other schemes were included.

8. New directions and problem areas in ecological studies and developmental models.

5. Schedule:

Day I

Morning: Discussion of workshop objectives, activities, participant requirements
Distribution of materials
Film-pretest exercise in observation and recording data

Afternoon: Field-oriented research education - historical and theoretical implication
Discussion
Ecological patterning and developmental sequencing (compared with experimental and clinical systems)
Elements of systems analysis
Discussion

Day II

Morning:
- Evaluation of models
- Use of electronic collection systems
- Introduction to video taping

Afternoon:
- Illustrations of the use of video taping in field-oriented research
- Participant practice in the use of electronic collection systems
- Coding systems
- Systems of data classification
- Discussion

Day III

Morning:
- Defining field systems and establishing behavioral parameters
- Discussion
- Practice: classification of data from presented case study

Afternoon:
- Further discussion of "grounded theory" and "situational analysis"
- Theory generation from field-oriented research
- Discussion

Day IV

Morning:
- Field evaluation of administrative structures
- Illustrations and discussion
- Participant consultation with staff concerning their individual research projects or interests

Afternoon:
- Participant-staff consultation (continued)
- Developmental models for counselors, counselor-educators, and supervisors - The use of field-oriented research as the springboard to switch from "research for verification of theory" to "research for generation of theory"

Day V

Morning:
- Developmental models (continued)
- Discussion

Afternoon:
- Summary and evaluation
- Participants' anonymous evaluations

6. Participants:

Of the twenty-seven applicants accepted for the presession, eighteen were able to attend for the full five days - eight males and ten females. Twenty-eight percent were counselor-educators, forty-four percent elementary or secondary school counselors, and the additional twenty-eight percent were counselor supervisors or directors of pupil personnel services.

Information on participant educational background indicated that twenty-eight percent held a doctoral degree, with the remaining seventy-two percent holding at least a masters degree (six at the doctoral dissertation stage).

7. Instructional Materials:

A two-hundred page handbook of selected readings on field oriented research was compiled and distributed to each participant. Lecturers presented a list of reference materials concerning their topics.

Five thousand dollars worth of electronic collection systems equipment was made available for illustrations and participant use.

Two films were used for participant practice in observation and data recording.

8. Evaluation:

At the completion of the workshop eighteen participants completed an anonymous evaluation form which was returned directly to the APGA Presession Committee. A report of the responses is given in an earlier section of this report.

9. Director' Evaluation:

The overall evaluation of the presession was that it was quite successful. This conclusion is based upon an analysis of the comments supplied by the participants at the end of the five days and a consideration of the extent to which the objectives of the presession were achieved. While it is recognized that the stated objectives are not manageable within a five-day program, it appears that the participants came away from their experience with more than just an awareness of the possibilities of field-oriented research. The participant-staff consultations near the end of the program indicated that several group members were able to apply their knowledge and skills to the individual projects they were engaged in back at their home base. The consultation

time may have been the most productive segment of the presession and will be expanded in future workshops.

While the staff is to be considered excellent for their individual presentations, command of their subject matter, etc., it would have been more beneficial had their efforts been more coordinated, sequential. It is expected that the complete presentation will become more effective with experience.

The number of participants was much smaller than expected. This may have been due to the later announcement of the presessions to the APGA membership. The small numbe fostered desirable staff-participant interaction and relationships. It is my impression that the informality resulted in considerable "peer learning."

PRESESSION V

1. Title: PROBLEMS OF RESEARCH SUPERVISION AND CONSULTATION

2. Staff:

Chris D. Kehas (Director)	Claremont Graduate School Claremont, California
Ricardo Gutierrez	Claremont Graduate School Claremont, California
Forest Harrison	Claremont Graduate School Claremont, California
Laurence Innaccone	Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Francis W. McKenzie	The Public Schools of Brookline Brookline, Massachusetts
Norman A. Sprinthall	Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts

3. General Description:

Statement of Need

The focus of this presession was on operations associated with the systematic supervision of research and on perspectives toward the conduct of research. In most circumstances, the only research most professionals conduct is that which is associated with their own academic degree programs; in many degree programs, the student is not offered any practice in research. Perhaps more unfortunately, doctoral candidates receive no systematic training or education in how to supervise their own students when they assume positions of leadership in school systems, state departments of education, or private or public agencies. The development of skills in the supervision of research, then, is too often left to accident or circumstance.

4. Purposes and Objectives:

The activities of this presession focused on instructing graduate advisers and school guidance leaders and had the objective of improving the quality of research conducted in education by guidance students and guidance

staff members. The direction of instruction was two-fold: (1) on perspectives regarding the conduct of research, and (2) on the development of skills in the supervision of research.

5. Schedule:

The training session consumed five days from Saturday, November 7 through Wednesday, November 11 with daily programs from 9:00 a.m to 5:00 p.m.

The session was held in meeting rooms at the Pick-Congress Hotel in Chicago, Illinois. Unfortunately, due to other use, it was not possible to schedule the session in the same rooms during the entire five days.

Each day in the mornings, we met as one large group. The mornings involved a presentation by a staff member, which was followed by discussion. In the afternoons, the participants were separated into small groups centered about their research problems and interests; each group had a staff member(s) who was conversant with that problem area. We first broke into three groups dealing with (1) evaluation and research design, (2) counselor effectiveness, and (3) supervision and university-field relationships. Staff discussion which followed the endof the first day revealed an overlap of participant interest. This led to a decision to dissolve group 2 and place its members into one of the other two groups. Each of the two remaining groups then had two staff members as resources.

The morning discussion and the small group work often continued over into lunch and dinner gatherings.

In addition, every afternoon before dinner, the staff held prolonged and intensive discussion wherein the events of the day were reviewed, and the plans for the next day reassessed and revised. These discussions were essential to the development and tailoring of the program to the needs and concerns of the participants in concert with the objectives of the presession.

6. Participants:

There were nine males and eleven females representing colleges and universities, local school districts, and public and priviate agencies. The distribution of participants by sex, place of residence, educational attainment, and nature and place of employment is outlined below.

Since this was a regional rather than a national meeting, and since no stipends of any sort were available for the participants, the presession attracted primarily participants from the Midwest with, however, notable exception. There was representation from the South (Arkansas), East (New York, Pennsylvania) and Alaska.

Sex	Number
Male	9
Female	11
	N = 20

Highest Educational Degree Obtained

Masters	5
Masters and Certificate	1
Doctoral Candidate	3
Doctorate	11
	N = 20

Place of Residence

Region	State	Number	
Midwest	Illinois	6	
	Ohio	3	
	Wisconsin	3	
	Indiana	1	
	Michigan	1	
	Minnesota	1	
	Missouri	1	16
East	New York	1	
	Pennsylvania	1	2
South	Arkansas	1	1
West	Alaska	1	1
		Total	20

Nature and Place of Employment

Employer	Position	Number	
Higher Education			
	Professor	6	
	Associate Professor	5	
	Assistant Professor	2	
	Instructor	1	14
Local Schools			
	Coordinator of Guidance	1	
	School Counselor - Counseling Psychologist	2	
	Assistant Director of Research, Cooperative School Rehabilitation Center	1	4
Agency			
	Employment Assistance Officer	1	
	Senior Research Assistant	1	2
		Total	20

7. Instructional Materials:

Applicants were requested to complete a Planning Data form for staff use and to bring to the session "a problem or set of problems" which they were experiencing in their supervision and direction of research with which they needed assistance. These materials were used throughout the session.

8. Evaluation:

As planned, the evaluation was accomplished through a questionnaire completed by the participants. We sought their judgement on a number of aspects. The questionnaire solicited responses to open-ended questions as well as ratings on a four-point scale, indicating the degree to which the respondent agreed with some descriptive statements.

Participant Ratings

Ratings were elicited on statements describing the substance of the program, program organization, and program setting.

1. Program

The participants were asked to indicate how valuable the various activities--individual presentations, ensuing discussions, and the group meetings--were in helping them meet program objectives, in acquiring knowledge, and in developing skills of research supervision. A four-point scale of value was offered: 1, Not of value; 2, Only slightly valuable; 3, Moderately valuable; and 4, Extremely valuable. Space was provided following each item to allow opportunity for the participant to clarify and/or qualify his response. The mean rankings are summarized in Table I.

MEAN RATINGS OF PROGRAM

Table 1

Activity	Mean Ratings: Presentation	Mean Ratings: Discussion
1. Fantasy and Reality in Research: The Unproductive Paradox	3.5	3.5
2. The Conduct of Research: A Process	3.6	3.9
3. Strategies for Institutional Change	3.6	3.7
4. The Research Process: Procedures and Proceedings	3.4	3.9
5. Field Studies: Sociological and Anthropological Approaches	3.6	3.6

For the individual presentations, the mean ratings ranged from 3.4 to 3.6 indicating a value midway between "moderate" and "extreme"; perhaps "considerable" would be a good way of characterizing the ranking. The most "technical" presentation received the lowest ranking.

With the discussions, the mean ratings were higher ranging from 3.6 to 3.9. The 3.9 rating was attributed to both of the discussions which followed the presentations by the staff member whose competence was in the area of measurement, evaluation, and statistical analysis. This result is to be contrasted with the low rating given to his second, more technical presentation as noted above.

The task group meetings received an equally high mean rating of 3.6. The ratings given to each of the two groups were examined separately and there are no differences between them.

2. Program Setting

The participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a series of four statements about the situational context of the presession. A four-point scale was offered: 1, Strongly disagree; 2, Disagree; 3, Agree; 4, Strongly agree. Here again space was provided for elaboration of participant responses. The statements and the mean rankings are as follows:

Pre-program information was adequate for my use in deciding whether or not to apply.	2.9
Pre-program information accurately described the program offered.	2.5
Arrangements for living accommodations and meals were satisfactory.	3.1
Physical arrangements (room, lighting equipment, etc. were satisfactory)	2.9
The daily schedule of activities was satisfactory (9-5:00).	3.7

3. Program Organization and Administration

A series of statements referring to the organization and administration of the program were offered to the participants for their evaluation. Their agreement was expressed as noted in Program Setting above. The mean rankings of the statements are as follows:

Qualifications and competencies of the staff were satisfactory.	3.9
The scope and sequence of learning experiences were satisfactory.	3.5
The balance between formal and informal activities was satisfactory.	3.6
There was sufficient time for individualized activities.	3.4
There was opportunity for each participant to express his ideas and views.	3.7
There was sufficient time for meeting informally with other participants.	3.4
Other participants were readily accessible.	3.3
There was sufficient time for meeting with staff.	2.7
Staff members were readily accessible.	3.3
New acquaintances were made or old ones renewed which will be helpful in future professional work.	3.7
A presession on this topic should be offered next year.	4.0

It is quite clear that there is sufficient evidence that the substance of the program was of considerable value to the participants. The discussions following generally were deemed more valuable than the presentations per se, perhaps, because they offered opportunity for participants to come to grips with substance itself in individualized and personal ways. This was especially true where the presentations were of a technical nature, that is, dealing with the actual procedures and proceedings of the research process. The group meetings also held considerable value for the participants as these sessions allowed opportunity for consideration of individual problems and concerns.

Pre-program information was deemed less than adequate and somewhat "misrepresentative" of the actual experience. The latter was, perhaps, somewhat unavoidable as most of the staff were unacquainted with, and had never worked with, each other. The link among staff and between staff and program was the Director and his proposal. This situation will be more fully discussed below. The point is that it was impossible to tell in advance what would emerge from the meeting of these staff members with these particular participants.

The occasion for the meeting was, of course, circumscribed by the proposal; however, the nature of the actual experience was not. For this reason, during the introduction to the presession, we shared the original proposal with the participants. We wished to take the mystery and mystique out of our efforts and to have participants join with staff in accomplishing the mutual objectives set for our meeting.

The living arrangements were satisfactory but it was more a question of putting up with the constraints of the experience rather than enjoying them. Since no stipends were available, and since only the travel of some participants was supported by their home offices, everyone was on a limited budget that was severly strained by living at a downtown Chicago hotel.

Despite these limitations, strong support was expressed for the daily schedule of activities which had been established.

The organization and administration of the program was in general deemed very satisfactory. The qualifications and competencies of the staff were deemed highly satisfactory. The scope and sequence of the activities, the balance between formal and informal activities, and the opportunity for each participant to express his ideas and views were all commended highly by the participants. A colleagueship, a feeling of mutuality of professional interests was developed as the participants reported that new acquaintances were made and/or old ones renewed which would be helpful in future professional work.

A sufficiency of time was reported for individualized activities, group activities, meeting informally with other participants, but much less so for meeting with staff despite the efforts outlined above.

There was little indication available from those who expressed an insufficiency of time.

The "insufficiency of time" was seen in part as a question of desiring even more than was available, in part not being able to participate more fully because of other commitments, and in part because of a reluctance and hesitation to infringe on staff. We should conclude that we could have taken the initiative even more with those who were retiring and reluctant.

The most summative evaluation possible is, perhaps, in the question of whether or not a presession on this topic should be offered next year. To a person, the participants all said strongly "yes."

9. Director's Evaluation:

The primary purpose of this APGA research training session on research supervisionaand consultation was to equip graduate advisors and school guidance leaders with some of the knowledge and skills necessary to improve the quality of research conducted in education by guidance students and guidance staff. The direction of instruction was two-fold: (1) on perspectives regarding the conduct of research, and (2) on the development of skills in the supervision of research.

Analysis of the results as revealed in the questionnaire completed by participants indicates that the objectives of the session were achieved to a high degree. New ideas and knowledge were imparted and a way of reconstruing the research process that held promise of power was offered. Participants reported renewed confidence in their abilities to conduct and supervise research. Participants' plans for using this experience on return to their work settings were many and varied.

The substance of the program as experienced through presentations, discussions, and small group work was judged to be of considerable, if not extreme, value. The competencies and expertise of the staff were evaluated as highly satisfactory.

The organization and administration of the program were found to be very satisfactory. The scope, sequence, and balance of activities was highly satisfactory. There was great opportunity for each participant to express his ideas and views. Time was sufficient for the various activities but there was some concern expressed about adequate time for meeting with staff.

All the participants felt that a presession of this nature should be offered next year, and most said they would be willing to pay a fee for tuition if federal support was withdrawn.

The reality of this conference and its staging had no base other than the "vision" of the Director who had worked in different settings with each of the staff individually and felt that they not only shared the "vision" but also were working in their own ways toward achieving the common objectives described in the proposal.

As such, there was much work needed to get staff together, comfortable with each other, and developing ways of working together. It soon became

evident to us that the staff needed long and intensive discussions among ourselves to operationalize and concretize the vision, each member's role in it, and our relationships to one another. This, of course, becomes conceptualized as staffing and the work as pre- and post-meeting planning but the dynamics of the process are never fully revealed.

As a consequence, staffing time – going from 5:30 to 8:30 on a number of evenings--did intrude some into the time available for some participants. Staff, however, was keenly aware of this and redoubled efforts to make all other time most available to participants and productive.

In the end, however, the assessment of the experience is best evidenced by the fact that staff--to a one--felt we had developed something worthwhile and expressed a desire to offer this presession again.

In this regard, I would like to make as strong a recommendation as is possible that this presession activity be maintained and expanded, and that it receive the full and continuing support of the APGA Research Committee, and of the research branch of the USOE. The value of these presesions is inestimable. The provision of opportunity for those in full-time employment in the field to come together with appropriate resources to get some training in areas where they feel they have a need is an excellent and invaluable experience--for all concerned. In some cases, it is a supplement, and in others a complement, to their previous graduate training. In either event, the experience is more intensive, more focused, and more individualized.

The presession is a service which should have great payoff in stimulating and improving the quality of research activities in the field, and in making research in education conducted by the University more powerful. It is a bridge for developing and maintaining a meaningful partnership between the university community and those in the field.